

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-23 are presently pending, of which claims 1, 12 and 23 are independent. No new matter has been added. Applicant believes that the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance as discussed below. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in view of the comments set forth below.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 7-19 and 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by “MATLAB Report Generator” by Mathworks, Inc (hereafter “MATLAB reference”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,708,825 to Sotomayor (hereafter “Sotomayor”) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,055,541 to Solecki et al (hereafter “Solecki”).

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

A computer-implemented method comprising:

- performing, using the computer, an analysis or synthesis operation on an executable graphical model representation that includes at least one executable graphical object;

- producing, using the computer, a report from the analysis or synthesis operation;

- generating, using the computer, one or more tags for one or more executable graphical objects of the executable graphical model representation provided in an executable graphical model editor program while producing the report;

- associating, using the computer, the one or more tags with one or more executable graphical objects of the executable graphical model representation while producing the report;

- associating, using the computer, the one or more tags associated with an executable graphical object with portions of the produced report corresponding to the executable graphical object while producing the report, wherein associating creates **a selectable connection from the executable graphical object provided in the executable graphical model editor program to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the executable graphical object, the produced report provided in a document viewer as textual content;**

- completing, using the computer, production of the report;

- receiving, using the computer, a selection of an executable graphical object in the executable graphical model representation upon completing the production of the report; and

displaying, using the computer, a location in the report corresponding to the selected executable graphical object in response to the selection on a display device.

Applicant respectfully submits that the MATLAB reference, Sotomayor and Solecki, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the following feature of Applicant's claim 1: *a selectable connection from the executable graphical object provided in the executable graphical model editor program to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the executable graphical object, the produced report provided in a document viewer as textual content*. The cited references are silent about a connection from a graphical element in a graphical modeling environment to a portion of text in a document viewer.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the MATLAB reference and Sotomayor does not expressly teach a "connection from the executable graphical object provided in an executable graphical model editor program wherein the report is provided as textual content" (Office Action, page 5). However, the precise claim language requires *a selectable connection from the executable graphical object provided in the executable graphical model editor program to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the executable graphical object, the produced report provided in a document viewer as textual content*. That is, the selectable connection is **from** the executable graphical model editor program **to** the document viewer. The present application uses the executable/simulatable graphical model representation as a navigation tool for the report. According to the present application, the user may scan through a graphical representation of a design, i.e., *the executable graphical object*, and access desired information, i.e. *portions of the produced report that correspond to the executable graphical object* (Specification, page 5, ¶ 1).

The Examiner asserts that the newly cited Solecki reference, combined with the MATLAB reference and Sotomayor, teaches creating a selectable connection between *the objects in the report* and to use the viewer of Solecki to see the html links in a viewer (Office Action, page 5, last ¶). However, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 does not recite a connection between *the objects in the report*. Rather, as provided above, Applicant's claim 1 recites a selectable connection ***from the executable graphical object provided in the executable graphical model editor program to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the***

*executable graphical object, the produced report **provided in a document viewer** as textual content.* The MATLAB reference and Sotomayor fail to disclose or suggest the foregoing feature of Applicant's claim 1. Solecki fails to cure the shortcomings of the MATLAB reference and Sotomayor with respect to at least this claim feature.

Solecki generally discusses a system for automatically generating a report from engineering data stored in a database (Abstract). In Solecki, the reports are generated by the push of a button, delivering HTML documents to the user's desktop for publishing, editing or archiving (Col. 1, lines 54-56). Solecki enables a user to jump to any section of the report using web page hyperlinks (Col. 4, lines 1-2).

However, nowhere does Solecki disclose or suggest a connection *from* a graphical object provided in an executable graphical model editor program *to* the portions of the report provided in a document viewer. Specifically, Solecki, alone or in any reasonable combination with the MATLAB reference and Sotomayor, does not disclose or suggest *a selectable connection from the executable graphical object provided in the executable graphical model editor program to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the executable graphical object, the produced report provided in a document viewer as textual content*, as recited in Applicant's pending claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that the MATLAB reference, Sotomayor and Solecki, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

B. Claims 2-5 and 7-11

Claims 2-5 and 7-11 depend from independent claim 1 and, as such, incorporate all of the elements of claim 1. Accordingly claims 2-5 and 7-11 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-5 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

C. Claims 12-19 and 21-23

Independent claims 12 and 23 recite similar features to claim 1. Specifically, independent claim 12 recites *a selectable connection from the simulatable graphical object provided in the simulatable graphical model editor program to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the simulatable graphical object, the produced report provided in a document viewer as textual content.*

Independent claim 23 recites *a selectable connection from the simulatable graphical object provided in the simulatable graphical model editor program to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the simulatable graphical object, the produced report provided in a document viewer as textual content.*

In light of the arguments presented above in connection with claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the MATLAB reference, Sotomayor and Solecki, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 12 and 23. Claims 13-19 and 21-22 depend from independent claim 12 and, as such, incorporate all of the elements of claim 12. Accordingly claims 13-19 and 21-22 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 12. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 12-19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

II. Rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the MATLAB reference in view of Sotomayor and Solecki and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 7,015,911 to Shaughnessy et al (hereafter “Shaughnessy”).

Claim 20 depends from independent claim 12 and, as such, incorporates all of the elements of claim 12.

The Examiner cites Shaughnessy for the teaching of generating a report in PDF format. Shaughnessy merely concerns providing a graphical representation of data gathered from various databases. Shaughnessy generally discusses generating a report from a plurality of data sources. A data source specification indicates the data to be retrieved from the data sources so that the

report may be generated based upon the extracted data. A view specification indicates how the data is to be visually represented within the report (Abstract).

Shaughnessy is silent about a simulatable graphical model representation having one or more simulatable graphical objects. Specifically, Shaughnessy, alone or in any reasonable combination with the MATLAB reference, Sotomayor and Solecki, does not disclose or suggest *a selectable connection from the simulatable graphical object provided in the simulatable graphical model editor program to the portions of the produced report that correspond to the simulatable graphical object, the produced report provided in a document viewer as textual content*, as provided in Applicant's claim 12.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-059RCE3. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: June 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Neslihan I. Doran/
Neslihan I. Doran
Registration No.: 64,883
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant